



## Executive Summary

The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, May 19-23, 2003 to provide the USDA Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester with recommendations regarding which project proposals submitted for funding under the CFRP best met the objectives of the program. The Secretary of Agriculture established the Panel as a Federal Advisory Committee on July 12, 2001 (CFR 1042-138) pursuant to the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393).

Two of the 14 appointed Panel members could not attend the meeting. The 12 member Panel revised their Bylaws and responsibilities under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The Panel then reviewed 40 proposals totaling \$12,438,425 in requested funding to determine which ones all the members of the Panel could agree best met the objectives of the CFRP. Using a consensus based approach, the panel members all agreed to recommend 14 of the 40 proposals for funding. The total for the 14 projects the Panel recommended funding is \$4,521,167. This report includes the Panel's findings regarding recommended funding, strengths and weaknesses for each proposal. Finally, the Panel provided general comments on the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program proposals and recommendations on improvements to program delivery, the Request for Proposals, the Annual Workshop, and Panel administration. A summary of the proposals recommended for funding and a list of all of the proposals reviewed by the Panel are included in this report. Meeting notes including the meeting agenda can be obtained by contacting Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, 333 Broadway Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102, telephone (505) 842-3425. This report and the meeting notes will also be available on the CFRP website ([www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp](http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp)).

## Proposal Review Process

Panel members individually evaluated each proposal to determine the degree to which it addressed the purposes, objectives and administrative requirements described in the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Request for Proposals (RFP). The Panel then met and discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal sequentially by number starting with CFRP-01-03 to develop consensus on a category of decision for each proposal. The categories of decision are:

1. The panel finds that the proposal is an excellent match with the purposes and objectives of the Act, and recommends the project for funding;
2. The panel finds that the proposal is a good match with the purposes and objectives of the Act, but has concerns about some aspects of the proposed project that must be addressed before the panel can recommend funding; and
3. The panel finds that the proposal does not clearly address the objectives of the Act and/or successful implementation is doubtful.

To stimulate discussion when an individual project was being considered, the overall category assigned to the project by each Panel member was displayed on a screen at the front of the room. The Panel discussed each proposal for approximately 20 minutes.

After all the proposals were discussed, the panel reviewed the proposals in category (A) to determine if there was sufficient program funding to award grants to all of them. The panel also reviewed the proposals in category (A) to determine if they were distributed equitably around the state and represented a variety of activities and approaches. The Panel then selected five additional projects from category (B) to recommend for funding to reach the total amount of available program funds for 2003.

The panel used a consensus based decision-making process to develop its recommendations, and submitted a list of recommended projects to the Regional Forester that does not exceed the total amount of available funding.

The Panel used the following criteria to evaluate project proposals and assign a category of decision:

1. Does the proposed project meet the eligibility requirements of the program in Section II and follow the format described in Section V, Application Information, of the Request for Proposals?
2. Will the proposed project reduce the threat of large, high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions (including healthy watersheds), structures, and species composition, including the reduction of non-native species populations on Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal forest lands?
3. Will the proposed project re-establish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression?
4. Will the proposed project replant trees in deforested areas, if they exist, in the proposed project area?
5. Will the proposed project improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees?
6. Will the proposed project include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, and Municipal government representatives in the design and implementation of the project?

7. Does the proposal include a plan for a multiparty assessment that will: identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; and monitor and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results?
8. Does the project proposal incorporate current scientific forest restoration information?
9. Will the proposed project preserve old and large trees?
10. Will the proposed project create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives? Are these opportunities consistent with the purposes of the program? Are summer youth job programs, such as the Youth Conservation Corps, included where appropriate?
11. Are the proponents capable of successfully implementing the proposed project?
12. Is the proposed activity in a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction?

**Comments For General Panel Discussion:**

1. What are the overall strengths of this proposal?
2. What are the overall weaknesses of this proposal?
3. What would be the effect of the proposed project on long-term forest management?

## Funding Recommendations

Proposal Number	Project Title	Contact	Implementing Organization	Administering Forest	Grant Request	Recommended Funding
CFRP01-03	Involving Unemployed Adults and Youth in Forest Thinning Practices, Contracting, and Biomass Business Development	Betty Vega	Grant County Local Ownership Development Corporation	Gila	\$262,786	\$0
CFRP02-03	Restoring Our Sacred Forests	Michael Henio	Ramah Band of Navajos	Cibola	\$358,557	\$358,557
CFRP03-03	Next Step: Forestry Market and Business Assessment	Tim Armijo	Pueblo of Jemez	Santa Fe	\$239,626	\$0
CFRP04-03	Chipper Project	F. Leon Martinez	Hub Resource Conservation and Development Council	Cibola	\$48,000	\$0
CFRP05-03	Data Development and Modeling for Forest Ecosystem Restoration	Yong Tian	The Regents of New Mexico State University	Lincoln	\$318,501	\$0
CFRP06-03	De La Sierra Lumber Recovery	Elfego Garcia	Larry's Sales and Building Materials	Cibola	\$359,639	\$359,639
CFRP07-03	Mobile Modular Harvesting/Processing	Sam Gutierrez	American Forest Products	Santa Fe	\$342,704	\$0
CFRP08-03	Project Management Roadmap	Edward Henderson	Energy Options	Cibola	\$343,435	\$0
CFRP09-03	Forest Thinning for Fire Prevention and Education for Youth	Brent Jaramillo	Village of Questa	Carson	\$333,100	\$273,000
CFRP10-03	Valencia Soil & Water	Flora Van Tol	Valencia Soil & Water Conservation District	Cibola	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP11-03	Forest, Fields, and Watershed Restoration by Navajo Youth	Laurie Monte	Ecological Restoration Institute, NAU	Carson	\$356,200	\$0
CFRP12-03	Forest Restoration Project for Taos Canyon - North Shady Brook	John Otis	Taos Canyon Neighborhood Association	Carson	\$356,200	\$0
CFRP13-03	Expand Small Diameter Product Processing and Removal Methods involving NF and Tribal Lands	Earl Velasquez	Velasquez Forest Management	Santa Fe	\$120,000	\$0
CFRP14-03	Reclamation and Utilization of Small Diameter, Low Grade Timber	James Cooke	James Cooke	Gila	\$360,000	\$0

Proposal Number	Project Title	Contact	Implementing Organization	Administering Forest	Grant Request	Recommended Funding
CFRP15-03	Bosque Ecosystem Restoration Jardines del Bosque Research Station	Claudia Oakes	SWCA Environmental Consultants	Cibola	\$341,522	\$0
CFRP16-03	Conversion of Forest Residue into Alcohol Fuel Called Ecalene	Gene Jackson	Power Energy Fuels	Cibola	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP17-03	Trimming, Wood Cutting, Vigas, Latillas and Equipment Purchase	Alfonso Chacon	Alfonso Chacon and Sons Wood Thining	Carson	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP18-03	Collaborative Forest Restoration Program	James Hammond	James Hammond	Cibola	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP19-03	Las Comunidades Forest Management Crew	Felipe Martinez	Las Comunidades Wood Products	Carson	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP20-03	Restoration of Historic Fire Regimes along the Rio Tesuque and Arroyo Cuma within the Pueblo of Tesuque	Linda Freedman	Pueblo of Teseque	Santa Fe	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP21-03	Rancho del Chaparral Fire Protection Program	Nancy Bryant	Girl Scouts of Chaparral Council	Santa Fe	\$197,962	\$0
CFRP22-03	Community Forestry Restoration Project in Enterprise Community	Max Cordova	El Greco	Santa Fe	\$356,563	\$356,563
CFRP23-03	Angel Fire Forest and Watershed Fuels Reduction and Thinning Demonstration Area for Education	Ken Bentson	New Mexico Highlands University	Santa Fe	\$385,584	\$0
CFRP24-03	Forest Heritage - Forest Restoration Healthier Environment, Create Jobs, Harvest Small Diameter Trees	Matther Herrera	J.C. Construction Services	Carson	\$320,000	\$0
CFRP25-03	Red Cloud Canyon Utilization and Reforestation Project	Dwight Luna	The Corona Group	Cibola	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP26-03	Small Diameter Timber to Value Added Products and Forest Restoration	Lynda Taylor	ZERI - Sustainable Communities	Carson	\$214,175	\$214,175
CFRP27-03	Valles Caldera/Jemez Fire Restoration Project: Science-Based Ecological Restoration and Hazardous Fuels Reduction	Patrick McCarthy	The Nature Conservancy	Santa Fe	\$358,696	\$358,696
CFRP28-03	Monitoring, Training, and Technical Assistance	Ann Moote	Ecological Restoration Institute			

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Implementing Organization</b>	<b>Administering Forest</b>	<b>Grant Request</b>	<b>Recommended Funding</b>
CFRP30-03	Turkey Springs Collaborative Restoration Project with the Lincoln National Forest along the Mescalero Apache Reservation	Thora Padilla	Mescalero Apache Tribe	Lincoln	\$240,000	\$0
CFRP31-03	Little Walnut: Wildfire Risk Reduction Project	Byran Runyan	Runyan Construction	Gila	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP32-03	To Thin Small Diameter Trees to Reduce Risk Of Wildfire and Disease Infestations	Ernie Cordova	Mission Trails Builders	Gila	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP33-03	The Santa Clara Woodworks Small Log Project	Gordon West	Santa Clara Woodworks	Gila	\$357,400	\$357,400
CFRP34-03	Riparian Forest Restoration in the Pueblo of Pojoaque	Tabitha Romero	Pueblo of Pojoaque	Santa Fe	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP35-03	Enduring Forest Restoration Project	Bill Redmond	America China Advance	Cibola	\$360,000	\$0
CFRP36-03	Rio Grande Floodplain Rehabilitation Project	Irene Tse-Pe	San Ildefonso Pueblo	Santa Fe	\$360,000	\$360,000
CFRP37-03	Glenwood Ranger District and San Francisco River Association CFR Project	Lou Naue	San Francisco River Association	Gila	\$118,739	\$118,739
CFRP38-03	Kingston and Poverty Creek WUI Thinning Project	Merry Jo Fahl	Jornada Resource Conservation and Development	Gila	\$356,000	\$0
CFRP39-03	"Doctor Forest" Recycling Wood Waste into Value-Added Erosion Control and Water Filtration Products	Kathy Deines	Silver Dollar Racing and Shavings	Carson	\$240,000	\$0
CFRP40-03	Socorro County/Rio Grande Bosque Fuels Reduction Project	Doug Boykin	Save Our Bosque Task Force	Cibola	\$170,010	\$0
				<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$12,438,425</b>	<b>\$4,512,167</b>

## Summaries of Projects Recommended for Funding

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 02-03  
ORGANIZATION: Ramah Band of Navajos  
CONTACT: Michael Henio, Jay Moolenijzer  
PROJECT TITLE: Restoring Our Sacred Forests  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Cibola  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$358,557

### Summary:

The proponents will conduct a forest inventory and develop an ecosystem-wide forest restoration and catastrophic fire risk reduction plan for the reservation. Partnerships with tribal, band, federal, state, BLM and other stakeholders will be developed to implement the plan. The project includes culturally sensitive, ecologically sound training for thinning, surveying, and planting crews. The proponents will then establish a private business cooperative for the crews to conduct forest restoration work on and off the reservation. The project will provide workspace, specialized tools and marking analysis for local artisans, and involve tribal youth in forest stewardship projects to restore their ties to traditional tribal forests.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 06-03  
ORGANIZATION: Larry's Building and Sales  
CONTACT: Elfego Garcia  
PROJECT TITLE: De La Sierra Lumber Recovery  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Cibola  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$359,639

### Summary:

The project will train a local workforce in the recovery and utilization of small diameter trees resulting from forest restoration activities. The objective is to use low impact techniques and equipment to reduce fuel loads by recovering and milling small diameter trees. Materials will be processed into 1"x 4" short wooden pallet stock and marketed to Albuquerque pallet manufacturers. Mountainair School System students and other community members will be included in a forest restoration and small diameter utilization education and outreach program.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 09-03  
ORGANIZATION: Village of Questa  
CONTACT: Brent Jaramillo  
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Thinning For Fire Prevention and Education For Youth  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Carson  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$273,000

### Summary:

The project will conduct forest restoration treatments on 150 acres on the Questa Ranger District of the Carson National Forest adjacent to the Village of Questa. The Village will purchase a chipper to mulch the slash and small diameter trees will be made available to local residents. The Rocky Mountain Youth Corps and the Singing River Field Center will conduct a Forest Ecology Camp for area youth.



PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 10-03  
ORGANIZATION: Valencia Soil & Water Conservation District  
CONTACT: Flora Van Tol  
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Thinning For Fire Prevention and Education For Youth  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Carson  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$360,000

Summary:

This project will remove non-native species, principally salt cedar and Russian olive, from 175 acres of Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District land in the communities of Belen, Los Lunas, and Tome. The project will reduce fuel loads and the risk of wildfire in the Bosque. It will enhance native plant and wildlife diversity by removing exotic trees that increase fire intensities and mortality and prevent the establishment of native vegetation. Native cottonwoods and native grasses will be planted to restore habitat for neo-tropical birds including endangered species. The project will develop and evaluate best treatment practices that: preserve native plants and reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire; reduce water consumption of non-natives; and improve communication and joint problem solving among Bosque managers and citizens.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 20-03  
ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Tesequ Environment Department  
CONTACT: Linda Freedman  
PROJECT TITLE: Restoration of Historic Fire Regimes through Removal of Exotics and Enhancement/Creation of Bosque along the Rio Tesuque and Arroyo Cuma within the Exterior Boundaries of the Pueblo of Tesuque.  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Santa Fe  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$360,000

Summary:

This project will remove exotic species and plant native species on riparian woodland along the Rio Tesuque and adjacent upland mixed piñon-juniper forest. The treatments will reduce fuel loads by harvesting dead and dying Pinion/Juniper. Slash will be chipped and spread. Prescribed burning to reduce the potential for ground fire advancement will be followed by erosion control and water harvesting activities. These efforts will enhance native grass regeneration and improve storm water storage and the short-term nutritional quality of surface soils. Ponderosa pine will be planted following treatment. CFRP funds will also be used to complete a NEPA Environmental Assessment.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 22-03  
ORGANIZATION: El Greco  
CONTACT: Max Cordova  
PROJECT TITLE: Non-Traditional Uses for Forest Products for Traditional Communities  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Santa Fe  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$356,563

Summary:

The proponents will train adults and youth in forest restoration, monitoring, and business skills. These trained crews will conduct forest restoration projects using stewardship contracts on the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests near the communities of Truchas, Cordova, Rio Chiquito, Cundiyo, and Ojo Sarco. Truchas Montana Youth Team will map sites, establish monitoring

points, and monitor forest restoration treatments. CFRP funds will be used to purchase equipment and develop a marketing strategy for carved vigas, and other products made from small diameter trees. The project will explore alternatives for small diameter tree utilization including biomass waste recycling, earthworm production, mushroom growing in inoculated mulch, and wood preservation treatment. The proponents will also set up a dirty chip central heating prototype.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 25-03
ORGANIZATION:	The Corona Group
CONTACT:	Dwight Luna
PROJECT TITLE:	Red Cloud Canyon Utilization and Reforestation Project
ADMINISTERING FOREST:	Cibola
FEDERAL FUNDING:	\$360,000

**Summary:**

The proponents will train a local workforce to remove dead small diameter trees from 120 acres of the Cibola National Forest that burned in 2001. The material will be used to make posts, beams, latillas, and vigas for markets already identified in Texas, New Mexico and Arizona. Slash, mulch, and sawdust from the treatment area will be used in an erosion control study that will layer sawdust with a soil cap in a berm to promote ponding. Deforested areas will be replanted using native trees, shrubs, and grasses. Students from local schools will be involved in reforestation, erosion control, and monitoring activities.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 26-03
ORGANIZATION:	Sustainable Communities
CONTACT:	Lynda Taylor
PROJECT TITLE:	Small Diameter Timber to Value Added Products and Forest Restoration
ADMINISTERING FOREST:	Carson
FEDERAL FUNDING:	\$214,175

**Summary:**

This project will construct an oven to produce non-toxic charcoal from small diameter trees harvested from Picuris Pueblo Tribal lands. Gases generated from charcoal production will be channeled into a second oven to preserve small diameter posts for fencing and landscaping. A third demonstration will inoculate slash from small diameter trees with native fungi spores to produce a growing medium for native mushrooms for sale in local markets. The project will also conduct a market analysis for these products.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 27-03
ORGANIZATION:	The Nature Conservancy
CONTACT:	Patrick McCarthy
PROJECT TITLE:	Valles Caldera/Jemez Fire Restoration
ADMINISTERING FOREST:	Santa Fe
FEDERAL FUNDING:	\$358,696

**Summary:**

This project will conduct forest restoration treatments (thinning and prescribed burning) on 590 acres in the southwestern corner of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and the Los Griegos area of the Jemez Ranger District, Santa Fe National Forest. The project will reduce the risk of catastrophic fire in ponderosa pine forests, restore fire-adapted ecosystems, build local capacity to carry out ecological restoration treatments, and develop science-based restoration and fuels

reduction prescriptions and monitoring protocols. Restoration and monitoring activities will be closely coordinated with other CFRP projects currently underway at Monument Canyon Research Natural area in the Santa Fe National Forest. Treatment prescriptions will be based on scientific methods and ecological assessments developed for the Jemez Mountain Fire Learning Network.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 28-03  
ORGANIZATION: Ecological Restoration Institute  
CONTACT: Ann Moote  
PROJECT TITLE: Monitoring, Training, and Technical Assistance for Multi-Party Monitoring  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Cibola  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$315,398

Summary:

This project will increase the capacity of CFRP grant recipients to design and implement community-based multi-party monitoring and assessment of forest restoration projects. Project partners will refine, field test, and revise the current draft monitoring and assessment guidelines for community based forest restoration projects. The project will provide training workshops and technical assistance to CFRP grant recipients on: designing a monitoring plan; involving youth and community members in monitoring; implementing field sampling; and analyzing data at the project level. The Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station will publish the guidelines after they have been completed and field-tested. The project partners will work with the Forest Service Southwestern Region to develop data storage and aggregation recommendations based on their experiences working with CFRP grantees.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 33-03  
ORGANIZATION: Santa Clara Woodworks  
CONTACT: Gordon West  
PROJECT TITLE: The Santa Clara Woodworks Small Log Project  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Gila  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$357,400

Summary:

This project will design, engineer and construct a log cabin using small diameter logs in collaboration with the Forest Service Forest Products Lab. The project will design and construct a log-processing machine to manufacture logs for cabin construction. A pavilion will be built for a community park in Santa Clara using this technology. Local workers will be hired to produce and market the product. The project will also design and construct: 1) a solar kiln for drying small diameter logs; 2) trusses for construction; and 3) porch roof and deck kits. A design for a commercial building using space frame trusses will be developed and a prototype constructed. The proponent will also design furniture products made from small diameter trees and set up a production facility. Classes will be offered for people interested in developing small diameter log utilization businesses based on these technologies.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 34-03  
ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of Pojoaque  
CONTACT: Tabitha Romero  
PROJECT TITLE: Riparian Restoration in the Pueblo of Pojoaque  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Santa Fe  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$360,000

Summary:

The project will reduce fire danger and restore 270 acres of riparian forest along the Rio Pojoaque and Rio Tesuque within the Pueblo of Pojoaque by removing Russian olive, Siberian elm, and Tamarisk trees and other invasive non-native species. Stumps will be treated with herbicide to prevent re-sprouting. Native woody and herbaceous species will be replanted. The project will encourage collaborative riparian restoration among neighboring communities, work towards a local consensus on what constitutes successful riparian restoration, and build support for restoration goals generally. The project will also document the ecological effectiveness of restoration efforts, invite feedback, and suggest ways to improve cost effectiveness of riparian forest restoration. The proponents will involve local people and a local Youth Conservation Corps program in training and restoration activities.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 36-03  
ORGANIZATION: Pueblo of San Ildefonso  
CONTACT: Irene Tse-Pe  
PROJECT TITLE: Rio Grande Floodplain Rehabilitation Project  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Santa Fe  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$360,000

Summary:

The project will reduce hazardous fuels and salvage firewood on 263 acres of Tribal land on the Rio Grande Floodplain. Tribal members will be trained and employed to carry out the restoration treatments. Russian olive and Juniper trees not useable for firewood will be mulched. Open areas will be planted with native Rio Grande Cottonwood. Bird surveys will be conducted to compare breeding bird use of treated and untreated areas. Tribal elders and religious leaders will identify culturally important bird and plant species historically gathered from the floodplain, and an education and work program will describe the need for floodplain rehabilitation and seek input from tribal members.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 37-03  
ORGANIZATION: San Francisco River Association  
CONTACT: Lou Naue  
PROJECT TITLE: Glenwood Ranger District/San Francisco River Association Collaborative Riparian Restoration Project.  
ADMINISTERING FOREST: Gila  
FEDERAL FUNDING: \$118,739

Summary:

This project will design and implement a watershed restoration strategy for the San Francisco Hot Springs riparian forest. The project will stabilize stream banks, remove non-native noxious plants, replant native species, and conduct an outreach program to educate visitors to the day-use area on the watershed and habitat restoration activities.

## **Recommendations, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Comments on Grant Applications**

<b>CFRP#:</b>	01-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Betty Vega
<b>Organization:</b>	Cooperative Ownership Development Corporation
<b>Forest:</b>	Gila
<b>Requested:</b>	\$262,78

<b>CFRP#:</b>	02-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Michael Henio, Jay Moolenijzer
<b>Organization:</b>	Ramah Band of Navajos Natural Resources
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$358,557
<b>Matching:</b>	\$89,641
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$358,557
<b>Category:</b>	A

**Strengths:**

1. A strong intent to develop a comprehensive forest management program.
2. A commitment to develop a forest management plan.
3. The development of a diverse collaborative process.
4. The development of a long-term training program.
5. The inclusion of an experienced forest monitoring entity.
6. A detailed monitoring plan that addresses ecological measures.
7. The involvement of community elders is appropriate and creative.
8. The proponents clearly state their plan to use ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
9. The proposal includes evidence that diverse partners have and will collaborate in project design, implementation and monitoring.
10. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives
11. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
12. The project would build on previous management experience that is closely related.
13. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
14. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment
15. The proposal includes education and demonstration activities.
16. The proposal is well written.
17. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
18. Old and large trees would not be cut.
19. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
20. The project as proposed would increase the value of small-diameter material.
21. The involvement of local artists is particularly interesting.
22. The proponents enlisted existing CFRP grant recipients in the development of their proposal.
23. The proponents strongly state their intent is to become self-sufficient in restoration of their own lands.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The forest treatment proposed may not clearly be known until thorough forest assessment is completed.
2. The monitoring and evaluation plan lacks detailed criteria for evaluating improvements in local management skills.
3. No unit costs for supplies.

**Recommendations:**

1. Insure that indirect costs do not include some of the categories listed as “other”.
2. CFRP funds cannot be used for treating private lands.

**CFRP#:** 03-03  
**Contact:** Tim Armijo  
**Organization:** Pueblo of Jemez  
**Forest:** Santa Fe  
**Requested:** \$239,626  
**Matching:** \$64,305  
**Recommended Funding:** -0-  
**Category:** C

**Strengths:**

1. This project is in an area of concern for hazardous fuel reduction.
2. The proposal includes a good array of collaborators.
3. The projects that the proponents are working on are generally aligned with CFRP objectives.
4. The proposal includes letters of support from diverse partners.
5. The proposal demonstrates that diverse partners have and will collaborate in project design, implementation and monitoring.
6. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
7. The project builds on previous management experience that is closely related.
8. The proposed business plan and marketing analysis supports enterprise sustainability.
9. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverages existing CFRP projects.
10. The proponent has a proven record of success implementing watershed restoration activities.
11. The proposal takes the next step on biomass feasibility and marketing.

**Weaknesses:**

1. There is no clear connection between the monitoring plan and the proposed actions.
2. There is a potential overlap in the cost of monitoring between this proposal and a previously funded CFRP project.
3. This proposal does not display a clear distinction between past CFRP funding and the proposed project. Organizations can only receive CFRP funding for two projects simultaneously if they are separate and distinct activities.
4. Jemez Pueblo received an EAP grant for \$42,000 for marketing and sales, which would provide an alternate source of funding.

**Recommendations:**

1. Better milestone dates need to be developed.
2. The indirect cost detail elements need to be clarified.
3. The pueblo needs to make further progress on requests for reimbursements on the 2001 CFRP grant before requesting additional CFRP funds.

**Comment:**

Delays in the 2002 EAP funding have impacted program implementation.

**CFRP#:** 04-03  
**Contact:** F. Leon Martinez  
**Organization:** Hub Resource Conservation and Development Council  
**Forest:** Cibola  
**Requested:** \$48,000  
**Matching:** \$14,250

**Recommended Funding:** -0-  
**Category:** C+

**Strengths:**

1. The project would provide limited local training and employment.
2. The project could provide a way to reduce the waste stream of slash to landfills.
3. The project would meet a demonstrated need as evidenced by the letters of support.
4. The proponents discussed the project with local businesses owners who may add value to the material.
5. The project could help private landowners organize and accept responsibility for treatment on their land.
6. There is a strong need for the requested equipment in this area for use on state and federal lands.
7. The proposed project is in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
8. The proponents would coordinate with the federal government to treat high priority areas.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The proposal may include treatments on private lands; CFRP funds cannot be used to treat private land.
2. There is no commitment to preserve old and large trees. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
3. The proposal does not include a plan for multiparty assessment. Projects funded under the CFRP must include a multi-party assessment to identify the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; and the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results.
4. The project does not provide youth opportunities.
5. Tribes and land grants were not included as collaborators or customers, and there are no letters of support from those groups.
6. There was no mention of replanting area.

**Recommendations:**

1. There are a number of other grant opportunities that might fund treatment on private land, such as four corners sustainable communities or State Wildland Urban Interface funding.
2. This area needs chippers and a means of disposing of slash on public lands.
3. Carefully review guidelines for multiparty monitoring and assessment which are available on the CFRP website ([www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp](http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp)).

**CFRP#:** 05-03  
**Contact:** Yong Tian, Carol Quintana  
**Organization:** The Regents of New Mexico State University  
**Forest:** Lincoln  
**Requested:** \$318,501  
**Matching:** \$131,499  
**Recommended Funding:** -0-  
**Category:** C+



**Strengths:**

1. This is an original approach to landscape scale issues of restoration.
2. The project could contribute to our ability to prioritize and monitor restoration projects.
3. The project would educate youth, but only in an academic setting.
4. This proposal focuses on a high crown fire risk area.
5. The distribution and dissemination of findings via a web page would be useful.
6. The project would provide useful science based information to assist land managers in determining specific risks and in deciding “what might be safe enough.”

**Weaknesses:**

1. Collaborators and partners do not represent a broad set of interests.
2. The proposal does not demonstrate a clear connection between the tools developed and CFRP users.
3. The proposal does not include a multiparty assessment of the results of the proposed project.
4. The software tools to be developed were not described clearly.
5. The proponents did not consider similar efforts being developed at Northern Arizona University or the Forest Inventory and Assessment being done by the Pacific Northwest Research Center.
6. The need for prioritization of restoration treatments has not been clearly demonstrated.
7. The appropriateness of CFRP funding for many budget items is not clear. Examples include \$7,000 per year for 4 years for attending scientific conferences and \$9,000 per year for software for 4 years.
8. It is not clear if this proposal is original research, which cannot be funded with CFRP funds.
9. The proposal does not include travel to CFRP workshop in the budget or work plan.
10. The proposal does not include a consolidated total budget with unit costs.
11. The Panel is unsure of the ability of land management agencies to utilize the product.
12. The research component based in Lincoln National Forest fails to recognize Mescalero Apache data or applicability.
13. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
14. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring.
15. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.

**Recommendations:**

Submit the proposal as an unsolicited research proposal to appropriate Forest Service research stations, the National Science Foundation, or other appropriate sources.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	06-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Elfego Garcia
<b>Organization:</b>	Larry's Buildings and Sales
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$359,639
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	359,639

**Category:** B+

**Strengths:**

1. Fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area as a result the proposed project.
2. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment.
3. The project would occur in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
4. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.
5. The budget is clearly presented and includes unit costs.
6. The project as proposed would increase the value of small-diameter trees.
7. The proposed project is related to NEPA ready acres.
8. This project would fill a coordinated niche in an area of need.
9. The proposal includes schools in monitoring activities.
10. The proponent submitted a letter to a potentially affected tribe requesting comment one month before submitting the proposal giving the tribe time to respond.
11. The proposal for pallet development is at an appropriate scale for the community.
12. The proposal leverages existing projects including CFRP grant recipients.
13. The proposal supports existing forest products enterprises.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
2. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
3. The proposed project does not clearly preserve old and large trees, and CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
4. The proposed project does not consider the protection of wildlife habitat.
5. The project is for thinning only, and does not appear to recognize fire as an essential ecosystem function.
6. There is a monitoring component, but it is not clear that it would be multiparty.
7. It is not clear that the applicant has the capacity to full fill the proposed obligations.
8. The proposal does not include a replanting component.

**Recommendations:**

1. Assign target dates to accomplishments.
2. Equipment under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
3. If funded, the grantee should contact Manzano and Chilili Land Grant Representatives.
4. The proponent must provide a specific plan to preserve old and large trees prior to awarding of CFRP funding, including old and large diseased trees and snags.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	07-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Sam Gutierrez
<b>Organization:</b>	American Forest Products
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$342,704
<b>Matching:</b>	\$89,286
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners. The project would build on previous

e

The propedl

**Weaknesses:**

1. This proposal is a study whose potential impact is not demonstrated.
2. The support letters were lukewarm.
3. There were no letters of support from any of the pilot projects.
4. The proposal did not include a plan for rollout or dissemination.
5. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
6. The proposal lacks a multiparty assessment plan as required under CFRP.
7. The budget does not accurately reflect the work plan.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proposal should include milestone dates for accomplishments.
2. As a roadmap the proposal should investigate smaller scale bioenergy applications.
3. Equipment listed under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	09-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Brent Jaramillo
<b>Organization:</b>	Village of Questa
<b>Forest:</b>	Carson
<b>Requested:</b>	\$333,100
<b>Matching:</b>	\$83,275
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$273,000
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal includes strong collaborative partnerships.
2. The Village would administer the project.
3. The environmental assessment should be completed by April 2003.
4. The youth training and education compo

5. The effects on reestablishing natural fire regimes would be indirect only, and short-lived without reintroduction of fire.
6. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
7. The proposal fails to include the use of ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
8. Under the CFRP, a multiparty assessment is required, yet the proposal does not clearly specify who would conduct the assessment and how.
9. The monitoring plan does not include specific ecological measures of on the ground results or improvements in local management skills.
10. Monitoring should include an evaluation and interpretation of the changes that result from the restoration project.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proposal should include milestone dates for accomplishments.
2. Equipment under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
3. Clarify what the chipper and truck would be used for after completion of the project.
4. The monitoring plan needs to include more detail on specific measurables.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	10-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Flora Van Tol
<b>Organization:</b>	Valencia Soil & Water Conservation District
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Category:</b>	A-

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal meets almost all the CFRP objectives.
2. The proposal includes a diverse array of support letters.
3. The proposal includes a replanting component.
4. The proposal included a strong timeline and task statement.
5. The multiparty monitoring plan is in-depth and clearly laid out.
6. Good maps are included indicating treatment area.
7. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.
8. Areas to be treated are clearly specified and large.
9. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
10. The proposed project is in a high visibility area.
11. Most of the CFRP funding would go to treatments on the ground.
12. The project would occur in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
13. The proposal documents the project history and demonstrates the applicant's capacity to successfully implement the project.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.

2. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring.
3. There was no mention in the budget or work plan of attending the CFRP annual workshop.

**Recommendations:**

1. The monitoring recommendation should be shared with other bosque restoration projects.
2. Consider bosque understory species while doing treatment and replanting.
3. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	11-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Laurie Monte, Wilma G Ennenga
<b>Organization:</b>	Northern Arizona University
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$350,721
<b>Matching:</b>	\$96,068
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal contains a strong youth component, particularly toward enhancing Navajo youth connection to the land.
2. The proposal utilizes Native American elder's knowledge.
3. The proposal incorporates holistic and cultural strategies, integrated watershed restoration, restoring biodiversity, and traditional ecosystem functions.
4. The business opportunities proposed were innovative and appropriate to the area.
5. Old and large trees would not be cut.
6. The project would create important local capacity for forest stewardship.
7. Diverse interest groups have collaborated in the design and would collaborate in the implementation and monitoring of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Restoring agricultural fields, native seed crop production, cheese production, and selling agricultural, and garden produce are not CFRP objectives.
2. The non-federal match in the 424 does not match the figures presented in the yearly budget justification. (the total project cannot exceed \$450,000 (the federal portion of the total costs cannot exceed \$360,000 and the minimum match by recipient cannot be less than 20%).
3. The effects on reestablishing natural fire regimes would be indirect only, and short-lived without reintroduction of fire.

**Recommendations:**

1. The panel encourages the applicants to resubmit a CFRP proposal and focus on the fuels reduction/forest restoration components of the project. Holistic projects submitted for funding under CFRP should focus on forest restoration elements.
2. Clear accomplishment dates need to be included.
3. Equipment under \$5,000 should be included as supplies.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	12-03
<b>Contact:</b>	John Otis
<b>Organization:</b>	Taos Canyon Neighborhood Association
<b>Forest:</b>	Carson
<b>Requested:</b>	\$356,200
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B-

**Strengths:**

1. The Forest Service is committed to completing the NEPA work for the project.
2. The proposed project would leverage a 2001 EAP fire plan grant.
3. The project would be implemented in coordination with other EAP and CFRP projects, including the CFRP 2002 South Shady Brook project.
4. The proposed treatment would provide a logical buffer on the north side of Shady Brook.
5. Proponents have built a strong working relationship with the Forest Service.
6. The proposed project is within the states 20 communities at high risk of wildfire.
7. The proposal includes letters to six Pueblos concerning the project.
8. Old and large trees would not be cut.
9. The proposal includes a detailed description of desired condition.
10. The proposal contains great milestones with accomplishments dates.
11. The proposed project would create jobs and develop a local workforce.
12. The proposed project includes education and demonstration components.
13. The letter of support from the Forest Service District Ranger indicates there has been strong collaboration.

**Weaknesses:**

1. NEPA is not complete, and is expected to be ready in 2005.
2. The proponent already has an ongoing CFRP project (funded in 2002) that is unfinished.
3. The proposal does not mention using a low impact treatment approach.
4. The monitoring plan lacks sufficient detail, particularly regarding measuring impacts on local management skills.
5. Indirect costs exceed 10%
6. Items under \$5,000 should be listed under supplies.
7. Chipper rental should be listed under 'other' line item.
8. The proposal did not incorporate responses from the pueblos.
9. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
10. The proposal does not contain a yearly budget breakdown with unit costs as required in the Request for Proposals.
11. Attendance at the CFRP annual workshop is not mentioned in the proposal.
12. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them during the development of the project proposal.
13. Workman's compensation costs are not included in the budget.
14. The cost of chainsaws appears to be too low for commercial sized saws.
15. The budget figures should be verified and be based on similar positions and should be verified for the length of time.

16. No letter of support from Rocky Mountain Youth Corp to do the contract thinning work.

**Recommendations:**

Provide a letter of support and commitment from Rocky Mountain Youth Corp.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	13-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Earl Velasquez
<b>Organization:</b>	Velasquez Forest Management
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$120,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$30,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B-

**Strengths:**

1. The proponents seek to deal with residual slash problems.
2. The proposal explores innovative technology that would be valuable to deal with air quality concerns.
3. The proponent intends to sort merchantable from non-merchantable material.
4. Old and large trees would not be cut.
5. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment.
6. The proponents seek to fill a niche and a need for experienced and skilled woods workers.
7. The proponents have demonstrated success in past projects as evidenced by support letters.
8. The proponents recognized the role of fire in forest restoration.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The proposal lacked descriptions of the operational aspects of burning technology design and application.
2. The proposal lacked a cost comparison to traditional slash and fuels treatments.
3. The proposal lacked budget details and specific unit costs.
4. There are no milestones with which to measure performance.
5. The budget lacks details on the match. The Panel was concerned about the validity of the match.
6. The project goals and objectives are not clearly explained.
7. The proposal lacks letters of support or commitment from project partners.
8. This proposal does not clearly state the roles of collaborators.
9. There is no monitoring plan to assess the degree to which project objectives were met, i.e. on the ground results and improvements in local management skills.

**Recommendations:**

Consider resubmitting a grant proposal to the Economic Action Program in the future.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	14-03
<b>Contact:</b>	James W. Cooke
<b>Organization:</b>	James W. Cooke
<b>Forest:</b>	Gila
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000



**Recommended Funding:** -0-  
**Category:** B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposed project would add value to the mill waste stream through firewood utilization.
2. This project would demonstrate a mechanized firewood-handling project.
3. The proposal is well written.
4. The proposed project would be in high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
5. The proponents recognize that thinning is a prelude to returning fire to the ecosystem.
6. The project would work with young people with special needs and create jobs and local employment.
7. The firewood processing system is mobile and could be moved to other areas needing treatment.
8. The proposal is the result of a collaborative effort with an existing CFRP grantee.
9. The strategy and budget in the proposal reflect a long-term goal of self-sufficiency.
10. This project may fulfill a critical niche in a comprehensive utilization plan for Catron County.
11. The proponent has identified existing markets for the firewood including out-of-state markets.
12. The project would capture out-of-state dollars for New Mexico.
13. The project would not negatively affect existing firewood markets in the State.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Under the CFRP, a multiparty assessment is required, yet the proposal does not clearly specify who would conduct the assessment and how.
2. The monitoring plan does not measure how well local management skills have improved.
3. The project did not contain a business plan or marketing analysis demonstrating sustainability.

**Recommendations:**

1. The values of the equipment used as a non-federal match need more clarification and explanation.
2. The proponent may want to explore Economic Action Program funding.
3. The SF424 needs the Employer Identification Number
4. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
5. Indirect costs exceed 10% and should be recalculated.
6. There may be business opportunities with other tribal and non-tribal enterprises.

**CFRP#:** 15-03  
**Contact:** Claudia Oaks  
**Organization:** SWCA, Inc.  
**Forest:** Cibola  
**Requested:** \$341,522.48  
**Matching:** \$108,460  
**Recommended Funding:** -0-  
**Category:** B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
2. Diverse partners have and would collaborate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
3. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
4. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
5. The proposal builds on previous management experience that is closely related, and would be part of current bosque restoration efforts.
6. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
7. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.
8. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
9. The project would be in a high visibility area.
10. The budget is clearly presented and includes unit costs.
11. The proposal contains a significant youth education program, which includes teaching plots.
12. The proponents submitted letters to seven potentially affected tribes.
13. The proposal includes a useful graph of their four-year activities.
14. The project would replant native species.
15. The proposal has an excellent monitoring plan for ecological benefits and impacts.
16. There is some added value in terms of cultural use, namely providing wood for carving Santos.
17. The project would include an exchange between Isleta students and National Hispanic Cultural Center interns.
18. The proponents contacted either Santa Ana Pueblo or a contractor to share methodologies for monitoring.
19. The proposal clearly indicates the project location and contains a map.
20. The project would use CFRP funds to do work related to NEPA compliance.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Form SF424 and 424a should reflect the total budget request for the life of the project.
2. A small number of acres would be treated and salaries appear to be excessive given the small number of treated acres. Salaries and SWCA overhead rates should be broken out.
3. Letters to tribes were sent out too late and responses from tribes were not included.
4. The source of the match is not clear.
5. The unit costs and number of units are not expressed consistently. The budget does not indicate the proportion of the year staff would spend on the project.
6. If the 'NEPA Resource Specialists' is actually multiple positions it needs to be listed as such.
7. The multi-party assessment plan does not include socio-economic measures of the project's education components or measures of improvement in management skills.
8. There is no mention of attending the CFRP annual workshop.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponent should consider involving interested tribes more in the design and implementation of their project.
2. Clarify the source of the match.
3. Consult with other restoration projects that are using herbicides to share information and experience.
4. Doug Parker, Forest Health Regional Office, might be a resource.

5. Strengthen the education/monitoring component of the project.
6. Expand the public education component.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	16-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Gene Jackson
<b>Organization:</b>	Power Energy Fuels, Inc
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$100,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	None

**\*\*\* CFRP 16-03 Withdrawn by the Applicant \*\*\***

<b>CFRP#:</b>	17-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Alfonso Chacon
<b>Organization:</b>	Chacon & Sons
<b>Forest:</b>	Carson
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B

Strengths: 109 0 0 109 134d15458 4202406 Tm B

8. There is a large discrepancy in acres proposed for treatment and the number of NEPA ready acres and no plan was presented to resolve it.
9. The proposal does not include a plan to use ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
10. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
11. Indirect charges do not appear as a line item in the budget and they exceed the 10% cap allowable under the CFRP.
12. There is question on the need for four trucks in four years.
13. The budget lacks detail on workman's compensation and other associated labor costs.
14. The budget lacks detail on support equipment, safety equipment, and other supplies.
15. It would be a challenge for the Carson NF to have an additional 800 acres NEPA ready within the proposed project timeline.
16. CFRP 19 & 17 both propose treating the same 405 NEPA ready acres.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponent should clarify which cut tree size cap would be implemented (specifically the 12" or 16" cap).
2. Clear milestone accomplishment dates need to be included before award.
3. Clarify the budget line items for the cords and latillas. Explain that the cost is for salvage and processing. They should be listed as labor not purchase of material.
4. Purchase of vehicles should be approved only with adequate justification.
5. The proponent should work closely and coordinate future treatment acres with the District Office. This may require the proponent to scale down the scope of the work funded.
6. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	18-03
<b>Contact:</b>	James A. Hammond, Patty Hammond
<b>Organization:</b>	James A. Hammond
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C

**Strengths:** none identified

**Weaknesses:**

1. There is only an executive summary and no proposal.
2. The budget contained no unit costs and was strictly business expenses.
3. There appears to be no collaboration.
4. There are no letters of support or commitment.
5. There are no time lines.
6. There is no work plan.
7. There is no monitoring plan.
8. There is not enough detail to adequately evaluate the grant proposal.

**Recommendations:**

Seek additional support and technical expertise for future proposals, from Cibola NF CFRP/RCA Coordinator, George Ramirez, and Phil Archuleta.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	19-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Felipe Martinez
<b>Organization:</b>	Las Comunidades Wood Products
<b>Forest:</b>	Carson
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C+

**Strengths:**

1. The project would create jobs and local employment.
2. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
3. The proposed project is located in a high visibility area for the local community.
4. The treatment would be in a NEPA ready area.
5. 913492.845ar r

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponent should work closely and coordinate future treatment acres with the District Office. The applicant is encouraged to scale down the scope of the proposal.
2. Future development of the bioenergy component should include the Forest Service Regional Bioenergy specialist.
3. Fire suppression crews must be red-carded to get state and federal assignments. An agreement should be developed early in the process on who shall accept the liability and sponsorship. (Red cards are given after appropriate training and are issued by sponsoring agencies.)
4. The proponent should work closely with the Forest CFRP/RCA coordinator and others and resubmit a proposal in the future.
5. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	20-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Linda Freedman
<b>Organization:</b>	Pueblo of Tesuque Environment Department
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$72,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Category:</b>	A-

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal is clear

**Weaknesses:**

1. The proposal did not clarify how local jobs would be created.
2. The match is insufficient and does not meet the required 20% of the project total (the lack of 20% is a math error that the proponent states can easily be corrected at time of award)
3. The project does not encourage utilization of small diameter trees.
4. The budget did not include annual costs.

**Recommendations:**

1. Create separate unit costs for local jobs to be created.
2. The solution to the match problem should not alter the project.
3. If you are planning to plant Ponderosa pine, the seed source should be suitable to the local environment.
4. Include finite dates for accomplishments.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	21-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Nancy W. Bryant
<b>Organization:</b>	Girl Scouts of Chaparral Council, Inc.
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$197,962
<b>Matching:</b>	\$80,901
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal is well written.
2. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
3. Diverse partners have and would collaborate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
4. The Cuba Ranger District will be doing an adjacent project and strongly supports this proposal.
5. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives
6. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
7. The project builds on previous management experience that is closely related.
8. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
9. The project would create jobs and local employment.
10. The project would accomplish education and demonstration.
11. The proposed activities would builds on ongoing efforts and leverages existing projects, including CFRP.
12. The proposed treatment is in a high fire risk area that is largely enclosed by forest. Treating this area is a high priority due to the season of intense use.
13. The proposal includes a clear, detailed timeline for the project.
14. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
15. The project successfully integrates forest thinning and the reintroduction of fire.
16. The project would use the Pueblo of Jemez fire crew and provide wood to the biomass project at Cuba High School.
17. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
18. The proposal is clear and straightforward.

19. The areas to be treated are large and clearly specified.
20. Old and large trees would not be cut.
21. The proposed project leverages and compliments the Forest Service decision to treat adjacent areas.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Letters of support from Jemez Pueblo were not included and there were no letters sent to potentially affected tribes.
2. The proposed project is to treat private land. CFRP funds cannot be used to treat private land.

**Recommendations:**

1. Explore using the Wyden Amendment authorities for funding this project, though this authority must be for watershed restoration.
2. Explore the Wildland Urban Interface grants for protecting private land through the State Forester's Office.
3. Explore the anticipated Southwest Sustainable Forest Partnership for funding.
4. Explore the New Mexico Forest Stewardship Program for project development.
5. The panel encourages the applicant to resubmit a proposal for treating adjacent public lands.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	22-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Max Cordova
<b>Organization:</b>	El Greco
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$356,563
<b>Matching:</b>	\$89,140
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$356,563
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
2. The proposal includes evidence that diverse partnerships have and will collaborate in design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
3. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
4. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
5. The project builds on previous management experience that is closely related.
6. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
7. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment.
8. The proposed project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives.
9. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverage existing projects, including CFRP funded projects.
10. The project would occur in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
11. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.
12. The areas to be treated are large and clearly specified.
13. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
14. Desired Future Conditions are specifically identified for the area to be treated.



15. The project is thoughtfully designed with good integration of non-government organizations and for-profit companies.
16. The budget is clear and includes unit costs.
17. The non-federal match is sufficient and clearly documented.
18. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
19. The proposed project would increase the value of small-diameter material.
20. The proposal is related to NEPA ready acres, including 1,300 acres.
21. The proposal demonstrates effective collaboration and/or consultation with tribal governments and land grants
22. The budget includes participation in the annual CFRP workshop.
23. The project would both thin the forest and restore fire regimes.
24. The budget reflects a high percentage of funding to be spent on salaries in a high poverty area.
25. The proposal addresses the needs in an USDA designated empowerment zone enterprise community (La Jicarita Enterprise Community).
26. The proposal includes a strong letter of support and commitment from Picuris Pueblo.
27. Proposal includes a good breakdown of administrative capacity.
28. The project uses innovative alternative methods of accomplishing treatment.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The proposal does not address replanting.
2. Milestone dates of performance were not included.
3. The number of acres to be treated is unclear.
4. A specific project area map was not included.
5. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
6. The proposal does not include a plan for ecological monitoring.
7. There is no technical discussion about various components of the proposal including mushrooms, charcoal, etc.
8. CFRP funds cannot be used to treat land grants, which are mentioned in the proposal.
9. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached, particularly the Tewa Pueblos i.e. Nambe, San Juan, Santa Clara and Tewa Hopis.
10. The proposal did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the proposal.
11. The Unit Costs for year two thinning crew stipend needs to be clarified.
12. Harvesting and utilizing trees in burned areas is not forest restoration and does not meet the CFRP objectives.
13. CFRP funds are for Forest Restoration by reducing the unnaturally high number and density of small diameter trees and not removal of dead trees from a previously burned area.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponent should provide a specific plan to preserve old and large trees, including old and large diseased trees and snags, prior to awarding of CFRP funding.
2. The budget should be revised to reduce indirect costs in the non-federal match.
3. An ecological monitoring plan should be described prior grant award.
4. Solicit broader involvement from conservation groups.
5. Shift the project emphasis to other NEPA ready areas.

6. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee should provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or include a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
7. Delete the term stipend, which has a specific legal meaning. Those costs should be identified and funded under different terms.
8. CFRP funds should be limited to forest restoration activities, not harvesting from burned areas.
9. Explore the opportunity of using Department of Labor WIA program to offset the cost of training the community members to do woods work.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	23-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Kenneth P. Bentson
<b>Organization:</b>	New Mexico Highlands University
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$285,584
<b>Matching:</b>	\$71,500
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B

**Strengths:**

1. The proposed project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives.
2. The project builds on ongoing efforts and leverages existing projects, including CFRP.
3. The proposed project is in high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
4. The proposal includes a clear, detailed timeline for the project.
5. The project would provide opportunities for youth including on the job training.
6. The project would support the University's forestry education degree program, which is important for New Mexico.
7. The proposed treatment site lends itself well to scientific study.
8. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
9. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
10. The proposal recognizes the importance of establishing wildlife habitat.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
2. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
3. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
4. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
5. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
6. The proposal does not include a component to add value to small diameter timber.
7. The treatments to be measured in the growth monitoring plots may not be sufficiently different to produce meaningful results.

8. Letters of support and evidence of collaboration were not included.
9. It is not clear whether the academic program would compete and potentially weaken the vocational program funded through previous CFRP grants. The distinction between this request and previous funding for Highlands University was not clearly identified in the budget.
10. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
11. Budget unit costs are unclear and need further breakdown.
12. The budget does not mention participation in the required CFRP annual meeting.
13. The proposal does not include replanting.
14. The Panel was concerned that the restoration treatments included in the proposal might be “over thinning.”
15. The ecological desired future condition stops short of including surface fire.
16. The cost for SAF conference attendance seems excessive.

### **Recommendations**

6. The project

1221956 092.6202 Tm(o)TjThe end of the report is specific.

5. The proposal does not include page numbers as required in the RFP.
6. The proposed project does not clearly preserve old and large trees.
7. CFRP funds cannot be used to cut old and large trees.
8. The proposal does not seek to add value to small diameter timber.
9. The proposal lacks broad and diverse partners or collaborators.
10. There is no monitoring plan included.
11. The proposal is primarily for business development and is not a forest restoration project.
12. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
13. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
14. CFRP funds cannot be used to treat private land.
15. The project does not state the number of acres to be treated.

**Recommendations:**

1. The panel advises the proponent to seek business development assistance and to explore other sources of funding i.e. Economic Action Program, Small Business Administration.
2. The panel encourages the proponent to work with the CFRP/RCA coordinator on the Carson National Forest for future proposals.
3. The agency staff working with this proponent should become more familiar with the CFRP goals and objectives.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	25-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Dwight Luna
<b>Organization:</b>	The Corona Group
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal addresses community concern about well site protection.
2. The project would create a positive outcome on a burned forest area.
3. The project would use biological sealers (chips) for improving water quality and reducing erosion.
4. This project would include out-of-state marketing via brokers, which would help build the local economy by developing the town's capacity.
5. Diverse partners have and would collaborate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
6. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
7. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
8. The monitoring plan includes local youth education training and involves the schools.
9. Old and large trees would not be cut.
10. The proposed project is related to NEPA ready acres.
11. The proposal included actual quotes for cost of equipment.

12. The proposal can complement and utilize existing knowledge from adjacent CFRP grantees.
13. The proponents seek to be creative in finding economic development opportunities specific to their community.
14. The proposal included innovative concepts for burned area restoration.
15. A letter was sent to a potentially affected tribe.
16. The proposal includes a positive media campaign.
17. The budget includes funding to attend the annual CFRP workshop.
18. The proposal clearly states the acreage to be treated.
19. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
20. The proponent re-applied and addressed most of the panels concerns from previous proposal submission.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The units in the budget are unclear.
2. The proposal did not include a plan for use of the small milling equipment once the 120 acre burned area is harvested and utilized.
3. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
4. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
5. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
6. Clear milestone accomplishment dates need to be included.
7. The letter was sent to the Mescalero Apache tribe too late.

**Recommendations:**

1. In the future the reintroduction of low intensity surface fire should be considered.
2. Verification of YCC costs should not be duplicated here and paid for by the Forest Service in other agreements.
3. Documentation of any tribal responses should be provided to the panel.

**Comment:**

Harvesting and utilizing trees in burned areas is not forest restoration and does not meet the CFRP objectives.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	26-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Linda Taylor
<b>Organization:</b>	Sustainable Communities, Inc.
<b>Forest:</b>	Carson
<b>Requested:</b>	\$214,175
<b>Matching:</b>	\$135,300
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$214,175
<b>Category:</b>	A-

**Strengths:**

1. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives
2. The proposal includes education and demonstration activities.
3. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.

4. The budget is clearly presented and includes unit costs.
5. A map is provided that clearly indicates the location of the proposed activities.
6. The proposal includes a clear, detailed timeline for the project.
7. Almost half of the administrative costs are included as non-federal match.
8. The proposal includes attendance in CFRP workshop.
9. This project will create new industries in New Mexico: charcoal and mushrooms from small diameter timber.
10. The proposal draws on ecological science i.e. innovative use of fungi.
11. The project would involve youth in baseline data collection.
12. Technology transfer of innovative uses of small diameter timber is included.
13. The project would be economically sustainable at the end of the grant period.
14. The project would explore innovative uses for small diameter material and create many value added small diameter timber products.
15. The proposal includes a diverse group of collaborative partners.
16. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
17. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment.
18. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverage existing projects funded by the CFRP and other programs.
19. The project will train Picuris Pueblo and La Jicarita EC youth and laborers.
20. The proposal demonstrates effective collaboration and/or consultation with tribal governments, specifically the Picuris Pueblo.
21. The project could serve as a model of cost effective small diameter timber treatment and product development.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies and rental costs should be included in other.
2. The ecological and social monitoring components are vague.
3. The proposal does not include the protection of old and large trees.
4. The proposal does not address replanting.
5. The Panel was concerned about the introduction of non-native mushrooms in our forests.
6. The proposal does not mention working with or training local community members to conduct forest-thinning activities.
7. The second year budget exceeds the \$150,000 annual limit.
8. A small number of acres would be treated.
9. There is no evidence of the stated participation of Max Cordova or Earthworks Institute in the implementation of the project. Their roles are not clearly defined in the implementation and multi-party assessment of the project.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponents should consult and incorporate the draft multiparty guidelines for community based forest restoration that are available on the CFRP website at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/spf/cfrp/>.
2. The connection between Picuris Pueblo and the proponent regarding collaboration on the past grant award should be explained in detail.
3. Monitoring of non-native mushrooms should be included.
4. The proponents should clarify that only native species of fungi would be used to inoculate trees.
5. The proponents should demonstrate the need and scientific basis for reintroducing mycorrhiza to old and large trees.

6. The proponents should demonstrate that the fungi to be inoculated are non-pathogenic.
7. The proponents should work with the BIA to utilize their forest management resources.
8. The proponents should include Tribal council resolutions in support of this proposal.
9. Reduce the non-federal match in year two.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	27-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Patrick McCarthy
<b>Organization:</b>	The Nature Conservancy
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$358,696
<b>Matching:</b>	\$91,186
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$358,696
<b>Category:</b>	A-

**Strengths:**

1. Letters were sent and conversations conducted with potentially affected tribes.
2. Areas to be treated are clearly specified and large (590 acres).
3. The proposal incorporates prescribed fire.
4. A detailed monitoring and evaluation plan is included.
5. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
6. Diverse partners have and would collaborate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
7. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives
8. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
9. The project builds on previous management experience that is closely related.
10. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
11. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverage existing projects funded through CFRP and other programs.
12. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
13. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.
14. The project would both thin the forest and restore fire.
15. The proposal includes a clear, detailed timeline for the project.
16. The budget is clearly presented and includes unit costs.
17. The non-federal match is sufficient and clearly documented.
18. Old and large trees would not be cut.
19. The proposal clearly describes a plan to use ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
20. The proponents have recognized the difference between the objectives of community protection and forest restoration and integrated them.
21. The proposal includes a good plan for forest restoration technology transfer.
22. The project would test hypothesis and contribute to our understanding of best restoration practices. The proponents are highly capable of implementing the proposed activities.
23. One of the Forest Service areas to be treated is NEPA ready.
24. The proposal includes contracting with local small business to build local capacity.
25. Strong letters of support from Forest Service field units and the Valles Caldera Trust indicate collaboration during the development of the proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The project does not provide youth opportunities.
2. The proponents need to clarify in the budget that federal dollars cannot be used to pay for food at a hosted workshop.
3. The proposal does not include a provision for replanting or mention that it is not needed in this project.

**Recommendations:**

1. Specific dates of accomplishment should be included in the grant at the time of award.
2. If federal funds are requested for printing, a long series of federal regulations must be followed.
3. The proposed project includes multiple entries that must be monitored for mechanical damage.
4. Documentation of any tribal responses should be provided to the Forest Service.
5. The proponent should coordinate and share information with the Valles Caldera on base line studies and other on going efforts.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	28-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Ann Moote
<b>Organization:</b>	Ecological Restoration Institute
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$315,398
<b>Matching:</b>	\$79,550
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$315,398
<b>Category:</b>	A-

**Strengths:**

1. The project would fill a critical need that has been identified for the CFRP as a whole, and may potentially benefit all current and future grantees.
2. The project includes support letters from diverse partners.
3. The proposal includes diverse partners that have and would collaborate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
4. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
5. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science and brings together key players in forest ecosystem restoration and collaborative community initiatives.
6. The proposed project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives.
7. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverages existing projects funded by CFRP and other programs.
8. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
9. The proposal is clear, straightforward, well written and user friendly.
10. The proposal includes a clear, detailed timeline for the project.
11. The budget is clearly presented and includes unit costs.
12. The non-federal match is sufficient and clearly documented.
13. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
14. The proposal includes attendance at the annual CFRP workshop.
15. The proponents conducted discussions with and received letters of support from some affected tribes.



**Weaknesses:**

16. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
17. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
18. The proposal did not include sufficient detail on the proponents plan to conduct a multi-party assessment of the results and accomplishments of their project.
19. The proposal does not mention replanting.

**Recommendations:**

1. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
2. The project should include more detail regarding the required CFRP multiparty assessment of this project regarding its objectives.
3. If funded, the Forest Service should send a letter to grant recipients encouraging them to participate in the trainings that could be held in conjunction with the CFRP annual workshops.
4. Mechanisms for disseminating information should be more fully described.
5. Specific dates of accomplishment should be included in the grant at the time of award.
6. Tribes and land grant heirs should be included in the design and presentation of the training workshops.
7. CFRP grant recipients need to have adequate time to plan attendance to these workshops.
8. The proposal should include a plan for monitoring of endangered species.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	29-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Henry Carey
<b>Organization:</b>	The Forest Trust, Inc
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$347,628
<b>Matching:</b>	\$94,436
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal includes a good use of small diameter material from a forest restoration project.
2. Areas to be treated are clearly specified and large (675 acres).
3. Proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
4. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
5. The project would build on previous management experience that is closely related.
6. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
7. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment
8. The proposed project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives.
9. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverage existing projects funded by CFRP and other projects.
10. The proposed project is in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).

11. The proposal includes letters of support from a diverse group of collaborators. The letter from the Forest Service District Ranger commits support and specifically identifies each contribution to be made during project implementation and confirms NEPA ready acres.
12. Affected tribes were sent letters early (one month before proposal was submitted) and there are on-going conversations.
13. This project would fuel a biomass generation plant at the Jemez Mountain School.
14. The cogeneration would use large amounts of small diameter material, which is what the CFRP is all about.
15. Old and large trees would not be cut.
16. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and the effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
17. The project, if successful, could provide a valuable model for crew establishment.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
2. The unit costs do not provide appropriate detail.
3. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
4. The proponent should pay liability insurance.
5. Agency personnel cannot be used as non-federal match.
6. Responses from some tribes were not included in the proposal.
7. Letters of support from the Hurd Brothers Logging and Jemez Mountain School do not confirm the financial match.
8. The proposal fails to demonstrate a clear separation from a previous CFRP grant (CFRP 26-02 grant).

**Recommendations:**

1. If funded, the match should be verified as non-federal.
2. If federal funds are requested for printing a long series of federal regulations apply.
3. Documentation of all tribal responses should be provided to the Forest Service.
4. Fire suppression crews must be red-carded to get state and federal assignments.  
Agreement should be developed early in the process on who shall accept the liability and sponsorship. (Red cards are given after appropriate training and are issued by sponsoring agencies.)

<b>CFRP#:</b>	30-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Thora Padilla
<b>Organization:</b>	Mescalero Apache Tribe
<b>Forest:</b>	Lincoln
<b>Requested:</b>	\$240,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$60,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B

**Strengths:**

1. The proposal would provide buffers along the streamsides.
2. The project would utilize small diameter Douglas fir trees as teepee poles.

3. The project would be in a h

**Strengths:**

1. The project would include 500 NEPA ready acres, once the archaeological clearance is complete.
2. The project would occur in the Wildland Urban Interface in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
3. The proposal clearly describes a plan to use ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
4. The proposal includes attendance at the annual CFRP workshop.
5. Old and large trees would not be cut.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The proposal does not include a comprehensive work plan.
2. The proposal does not contain letters of support.
3. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
4. The proposal did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
5. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
6. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
7. The proposed project does not clearly preserve old and large trees.
8. The project is for thinning only, and does not appear to recognize fire as an essential ecosystem function.
9. Under the CFRP, a multiparty assessment is required, yet the proposal does not clearly specify who would conduct the assessment and how. There are no specific ecological measures of on the ground results or improvements in local management skills. Monitoring should include an evaluation and interpretation of the changes that result from the restoration project.
10. The budget does not include detailed unit costs.
11. The project would not create training opportunities or sustainable employment.
12. The project would not provide youth opportunities.
13. The proposal does not indicate the number of acres to be treated.
14. The proponent must provide a specific plan to preserve old and large trees prior to awarding of CFRP funding, including old and large diseased trees and snags.
15. Clear milestone accomplishment dates need to be included

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponent is encourage to coordinate with existing programs and projects in the local area.
2. Clear milestone accomplishment dates need to be included.
3. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	32-03
<b>Contact:</b>	David Manzi, Ernie Cordova
<b>Organization:</b>	Mission Trails Builders
<b>Forest:</b>	Gila
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000

**Matching:** \$90,000  
**Recommended Funding:** -0-  
**Category:** C

**Strengths:**

1. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment in an area of high need.
2. A large number of letters of support from local business were included in the proposal.
3. The proposal clearly describes a plan to use ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
4. The proponent seeks to treat the lowest value wood and provide a value added product.
5. The proposal included very good documentation on related thinning experience demonstrated capability.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The letter of support from the Forest Service was not on letterhead.
2. The budget was very vague and lacked detailed unit costs.
3. There was no map indicating the area to be treated.
4. The proposal does not include a provision for replanting or mention that it is not needed in this project.
5. Clear accomplishment milestone dates need to be included.
6. The effects on reestablishing natural fire regimes would be indirect only, and short-lived without reintroduction of fire.
7. The monitoring and assessment plan should include an evaluation and interpretation of the changes that result from the restoration project.
8. The proposal did not include a plan to preserve old and large trees.
9. There is no multiparty assessment as required by CFRP.
10. The budget did not include funding to attend the required annual CFRP workshop.
11. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
12. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring.

**Recommendations:**

1. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
2. The proponent should submit a plan for preserving old and large trees, including diseased trees and snags, prior to CFRP grant award.

**CFRP#:** 33-03  
**Contact:** Gordon West  
**Organization:** Santa Clara Woodworks  
**Forest:** Gila  
**Requested:** \$357,400  
**Matching:** \$90,140  
**Recommended Funding:** \$357,400  
**Category:** A-

**Strengths:**

1. The project would add value to small diameter timber.

2. The budget is clearly presented and includes unit costs.
3. The proposal is clear and straightforward.
4. The project would stimulate local economic development in an economically depressed area.
5. Old and large trees would not be cut.
6. The project would create jobs and local employment.
7. The project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives.
8. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverages existing projects funded by CFRP and other programs.
9. The project would be in a high fire risk area (e.g. one of the 20 communities at highest risk in the state).
10. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
11. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
12. The project would build on previous management experience that is closely related.
13. The proposed project is in a high visibility area.
14. The project would increase the value of small-diameter material.
15. A diverse and balanced group of stakeholders with a demonstrated history of success would implement the project.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The unit cost categories need clarification.
2. The monitoring plan does not include specific ecological measures of on the ground results or improvements in local management skills.
3. The supply of wood is dependent upon entities beyond the proponent's control.

**Recommendations:**

The majority of the raw material should result from forest restoration activities on public lands.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	34-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Tabitha Romero
<b>Organization:</b>	Pueblo of Pojoaque
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Category:</b>	A-

**Strengths:**

1. The project would replant native woody and herbaceous species.
2. This project would be self sufficient except for monitoring at the end of the grant period.
3. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
4. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science
5. The project would create jobs and local employment.
6. The project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives.
7. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverages existing projects funded by CFRP and other programs.
8. The proposed treatment would occur in a high fire risk area.
9. The project would involve youth in traditional Spanish and Native American art projects.

10. The project demonstrates opportunities to strengthen tribal resource management self-determination.
11. The proposal included a tribal resolution in support of the project.
12. This project would replant box elder, which may have been much more prevalent in the past.
13. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
14. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.
15. Areas to be treated are clearly specified and large.
16. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
17. Diverse partners have and would collaborate in design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
18. As a result of this project, tribal youth may be potential participants in the CFRP project with New Mexico Highlands.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The budget lacks detailed unit costs.
2. Clear milestone accomplishment dates are not included.
3. The indirect costs exceed the allowable 10%.
4. The proposal did not display a process to include traditional and tribal values in the project design.

**Recommendations:**

1. Upon award be more specific on performance dates.
2. Proponents should collaborate with other tribes incorporating traditional and cultural values in restoration projects.
3. The proposal might be strengthened by demonstration of internal consultation with tribal members.
4. The proposal might be strengthened by consultation with traditional land grant heirs with respect to traditional uses of the land.
5. The current budget shows a 20% indirect cost, which must be adjusted to 10%.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	135-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Bill Redmond
<b>Organization:</b>	America China Advance, LLC
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C+

**Strengths:**

1. The proponents seek to find solutions for capital and equipment acquisition for business formation.
2. The proponents seek to provide opportunities for the sustainability of large forest treatment projects.
3. The proposal specifically addresses financing for large biomass projects.
4. The project could possibly provide an infusion of outside investment to local businesses.

5. The proposal included a detailed timeline.
6. The proposal demonstrates effective collaboration and/or consultation with land grant communities.
7. The proposal takes a macro approach versus a micro approach to economic development and forest restoration, particularly with regard to building local capacity in underrepresented communities
8. Old and large trees would not be cut.
9. The source of and commitment for the match is clear.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The project's organization and connection to clientele is not clear.
2. It is not clear how the proponent would determine who would receive the investment funding.
3. It is not clear how investors would benefit from the project.
4. The budget and work plan did not address attendance at the CFRP workshop
5. There is no multiparty assessment as required by CFRP. No plan is described to evaluate and interpret the changes that result from this project.
6. The proposal makes no mention of ecologically sound restoration practices described under CFRP such as reintroduction of appropriate fire, and low impact treatment techniques and replanting.
7. There is no letter of support from the Forest Service or other relevant land management agency as required under the CFRP.
8. The proposal did not demonstrate the capacity or ability to accomplish the project objectives.
9. There were no tribal letters of support attached.
10. The proposal did not include a description of the role each partner would play during project implementation and monitoring as required under the CFRP.
11. No specific project sites were mentioned.
12. There is no guaranteed supply of material to sustain this project. This is considered a risk capital project

**Recommendations:**

1. If funded, travel outside the US would need to show benefit to CFRP program.
2. If funded, the proponent must commit to sound restoration practices.
3. Documentation of any tribal responses should be provided to the Forest Service.

**Comment:**

The proponent is encouraged to resubmit the proposal next year addressing the weaknesses and recommendations of the Panel.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	36-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Irene Tse-Pe
<b>Organization:</b>	Pueblo of San Ildefonso
<b>Forest:</b>	Santa Fe
<b>Requested:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$90,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$360,000
<b>Category:</b>	A-



**Strengths:**

1. The project would treat a wide area of the bosque area of tribal lands.
2. The areas to be treated are clearly specified and large (263 acres).
3. The project recognizes the importance of heterogeneous habitat.
4. There is a commitment to maintain the continuity of the project after the funding is complete. The proponents plan to complete the entire reach of the bosque.
5. The project would connect bird diversity monitoring to the treatment.
6. Santa Fe Indian School would support the project and would collaborate as a partner during implementation.
7. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
8. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
9. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
10. The proposed project would accomplish education and demonstration objectives by involving youth in monitoring activities.
11. A detailed monitoring plan is included that addresses both ecological measures and effectiveness of the project in building local expertise and capacity for ecological restoration.
12. The proposal is clear and straightforward.
13. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
14. The proposed project is in a high visibility area.
15. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment.
16. The project would both thin the forest and restore fire.
17. The budget is clearly laid out and includes unit costs.
18. The non-federal match is sufficient and clearly documented.
19. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
20. The proposal includes a reference to consultation with tribal members regarding cultural benefits and implications.
21. The project addresses the intersection of bosque restoration and the presence of culturally important wildlife.
22. The proposal includes a tribal resolution in support of the project.
23. The project demonstrates opportunities to strengthen tribal resource management self-determination.
24. The proposal and project would utilize a tribal GIS database.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
2. The project does not add value to small diameter material.
3. The monitoring plan lacked sufficient detail.
4. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
5. Clear milestone accomplishment dates need to be included

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponents should collaborate with the Rio Grande Conservancy Bosque Restoration.
2. The project should be encouraged to continue.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	37-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Lou Naue
<b>Organization:</b>	San Francisco River Association
<b>Forest:</b>	Gila
<b>Requested:</b>	\$118,739
<b>Matching:</b>	\$31,261
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	\$118,739
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. The proponents have acquired the necessary permits from Army Corp of Engineers and New Mexico Environment Department.
2. The proposal includes a letter of commitment for the in-kind match.
3. The project emanates from excellent local partnerships and organizing efforts.
4. The proposal includes support letters from diverse partners.
5. The proposal includes diverse partners that have and would collaborate in design, implementation and monitoring of the project.
6. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives
7. The proposal incorporates ecological restoration science.
8. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment
9. The project would accom

5. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
6. The budget does not follow CFRP Request for Proposal format.
7. The project would not provide youth opportunities.
8. The project would not encourage utilization of small diameter trees.
9. The proposal did not state the number of acres to be treated.
10. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
11. Clear milestone accomplishment dates need to be included (who, what, when).
12. The letter of support from the Forest Service does not indicate that the project includes NEPA ready acres.
13. The proposal did not include page numbers as required by the RFP.
14. The proposal does not clearly describe the location of the project.

**Recommendations:**

1. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
2. The value of the project could be greatly increased with a strong ecological monitoring effort, following the CFRP multiparty guidelines.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	38-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Merry Jo Fahl
<b>Organization:</b>	Jornada Resource Conservation & Development, Inc
<b>Forest:</b>	Gila
<b>Requested:</b>	\$356,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$94,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. Areas to be treated are clearly specified and would include 41 acres per year.
2. Old and large trees would not be cut; the proposal states a 16" cutting cap.
3. The project would add value to harvested wood by using it fuelwood.
4. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives
5. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area
6. The project would treat pinyon-juniper, a vegetation type in need of restoration.
7. The budget is clear and includes unit costs.
8. The proposal is related to NEPA ready acres.
9. Monitoring activities involve local high school clubs.
10. The proposal includes diverse partners that have collaborated in design of the project.
11. The proposal shows initiative by the local RC&D to fulfill Forest Service initiated project.
12. The project includes a plan to maintain the fuel treatment with prescribed burning every 2-4 years.
13. The project would both thin the forest and restore fire.

**Weaknesses:**

1. The budget as provided exceeds the CFRP limit on both the SF 424 form and the budget justification.

2. If the proponent is reducing the in-kind match, it is unclear what activities would not be conducted or expenses incurred.
3. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
4. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring.
5. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
6. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
7. The proposal fails to include the use of ecologically appropriate low-impact thinning techniques and technology.
8. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
9. Clear milestone accomplishment dates were not included.
10. Participation at the annual CFRP workshop was not included in the work plan or budget.
11. The monitoring plan lacks sufficient detail.
12. The budget indicates 42 acres per year under units, when the correct acres are 41.

**Recommendations:**

1. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
2. The monitoring plan should include an evaluation and interpretation of the changes that resulted from the restoration project.
3. The proponents should investigate the use of low-impact thinning technology, to minimize soil disturbance.
4. The proponents are encouraged to seek out participation by local conservation minded community members in the multiparty assessment.
5. Prior to award the proponent must demonstrate how the proposed monitoring plan will be accomplished, given that all expenses are listed under in-kind.
6. If the subcontract bid is less than the designated amount (\$2,000 per acre) then the proponent should state that they would expand the acres treated to reflect the amount available.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	39-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Kathy Deine
<b>Organization:</b>	Silver Dollar Racing and Shavings
<b>Forest:</b>	Carson
<b>Requested:</b>	\$240,000
<b>Matching:</b>	\$60,000
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	C+

**Strengths:**

1. The proposed project is consistent with CFRP objectives.
2. The project would build on previous management experience that is closely related.
3. As a result of this project, fuels would be treated in a high fire risk area.
4. The proposed project would create jobs and local employment.
5. The proposal is clear, straightforward and well written.

6. The proposal is thoughtfully designed with good integration of non-government organizations and for-profit companies.
7. The non-federal match is sufficient and clearly documented.
8. Old and large trees would not be cut.
9. The proponent recognizes the role of fire in forest restoration.
10. The project would add value to waste material.
11. The project demonstrates a strong partnership with the Forest Products Laboratory.
12. The proposal includes attendance at the annual CFRP workshop.
13. The proposal included a good description of milestones and due dates.
14. The products could be very useful for local fire rehabilitation and valuable if locally available.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
2. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
3. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
4. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
5. The monitoring plan lacks detail and does not document improvement in local management skills.
6. The material supply from public lands is undocumented and therefore not assured.
7. The Forest Service letter of support specifically mentions private land materials.
8. It appears that there are no NEPA ready acres for this project.
9. CFRP funds may not be used to subcontract with the Forest Products Laboratory.
10. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
11. CFRP funds cannot be used to treat private land. Processing facilities may be located on private land if the intent is to utilize material resulting from forest restoration activities on public land.
12. The work plan and description of activities are vague.

**Recommendations:**

1. The proponent should document the collaboration. The proposal mentions attending meetings, but did not include letters of support from collaborators.
2. The \$35,000 for the Forest Products Laboratory, identified in the proposal, needs to either be eliminated or redirected to another entity for the same purpose.
3. Collaborate with local thinning operations to possibly provide raw material for the project.
4. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
5. The proponent is encouraged to reapply to the CFRP once NEPA ready sites have been committed, or the timeline for completing NEPA is clearly defined.

<b>CFRP#:</b>	40-03
<b>Contact:</b>	Douglas Boykin
<b>Organization:</b>	Save our Bosque Taskforce
<b>Forest:</b>	Cibola
<b>Requested:</b>	\$170,010

<b>Matching:</b>	\$43,158
<b>Recommended Funding:</b>	-0-
<b>Category:</b>	B+

**Strengths:**

1. A non-federal match is clearly demonstrated.
2. The proposal builds on previous management experience that is closely related.
3. The project would build on ongoing efforts and leverages existing projects funded by CFRP and other programs.
4. The project supports the objectives of the Rio Grande Bosque Biological Management Plan.
5. The proposal is clear and straightforward.
6. Ninety-nine acres are clearly specified for treatment.
7. The abundance of native species would increase as a result of this project.
8. Most of the CFRP funding would go to treatments on the ground.
9. Desired Future Conditions are specifically identified for the area to be treated.
10. The budget is clear and includes unit costs.
11. The project would provide opportunities for youth.
12. The taskforce utilizes an existing environmental action plan.
13. The proposal is related to NEPA ready acres.
14. The project restores a community of potentially high biological diversity.
15. Old and large native trees would not be cut.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Letters to all affected tribes or pueblos soliciting comments and concerns were not attached.
2. The project did not include all appropriate tribal government representatives in design, implementation, and monitoring of the project.
3. Community land grants are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
4. Environmental groups are critical stakeholders and the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient effort to consult or collaborate with them.
5. Equipment that is under \$5,000 should be listed as supplies.
6. The monitoring plan does not include specific ecological measures of on the ground results or measures of improvements in local management skills.
7. The project would not add value to small diameter trees.
8. The budget lacks detailed unit costs for personnel and sub-contractors (e.g. number of people, hourly rate).

**Recommendations:**

1. Prior to award, the proponents clarify that all treatments are to be conducted on public lands.
2. The proponent should provide a letter from the US Fish and Wildlife Service confirming approval of the use of Garlon 3A and 4 in this bosque and license for applicators.
3. Prior to award of CFRP funding, the grantee must provide a letter of support from all affected tribes or pueblos or a letter documenting a consultation meeting has occurred.
4. Consult with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and the Rocky Mountain Research Lab regarding protocols and ideas for bosque multiparty assessment and monitoring pursuant to CFRP requirements.

## General Comments on the Grant Applications

1. Forest Service employees told grant applicants that Davis Bacon rates apply on thinning contracts. That may be incorrect. The Forest Service needs to clarify what authority should be used to specify required wages.
2. Provide CFRP panel with multiparty assessment report for completed projects and performance reports for ongoing projects that have been previously funded for projects being considered by the Panel for funding
3. The values of the equipment used as a non-federal match needs more clarification/explanation.
4. Proponents should clearly demonstrate how their proposal encourages sustainable communities, particularly with regards to building local capacity and management skills
5. When prior awards have been granted, include information to ensure projects are not duplicating or overlapping.
6. The project should be economically sustainable at the end of the grant period.
7. Agency staff associated with proposal development should be **STRONGLY** encouraged to attend the annual CFRP workshop.
8. In the future the reintroduction of low intensity surface fire should be considered.
9. Documentation of any tribal responses should be provided to the panel.
10. Specific dates of accomplishment should be included in the grant application and amended at the time of award.
11. For applicants that are resubmitting, include an appendix summarizing how the revised proposal addresses prior recommendations of the CFRP panel.
12. The guidelines for CFRP grant recipients to sub contract with Forest Service Units needs to be clarified and communicated to field units.
13. Prior to award, the proponent should provide a letter from US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) confirming approval the use of Garlon 3A and 4 in this bosque and license for applicators, if required or applicable.
14. The Forest Service should obtain a letter from USFWS regarding their policy for herbicide use along the Rio Grande.
15. Consultation with potentially interested tribes, land grants, and environmental groups should occur at least one month before the proposal is submitted.
16. The boilerplate consultation letter should be revised.
17. CFRP Panel should be provided with copies of the latest reports (final project report and others) from every CFRP project prior to the annual CFRP Workshop.
18. CFRP Panel attendance by Program Coordinators added significantly to the CFRP process.
19. The ability of a proponent to be able to meet multiple CFRP objectives is a strength.

## **Recommendations for Improving Program Delivery**

1. More positive press releases on program accomplishment. Could be conducted through collaboration between grantees and FS Staff.
2. Consistent with CFRP philosophy and objectives, double-sided photocopy should be used for copies of proposal sent to panel to review.
3. Organize a press conference in conjunction with annual CFRP workshop, including a panel of grantees
4. Handy guide for CFRP projects – driving guide with locations of projects statewide including contact information
5. Certified Level II G&A Specialists need to be provided to each Forest.
6. Charter should be modified to allow staggered Panel terms.



## Recommendations for Improving the Request for Proposals

1. RFP should indicate to the applicants that the collaboration requirements are significant. Collaboration should precede the application process.
2. State in RFP that applicants that are resubmitting, include an appendix summarizing how this proposal address prior recommendations of the CFRP panel
3. EMPHASIZE that page numbers are necessary
4. The RFP should make clear to potential proponents that the Forest Service will review their performance and final multiparty assessment.
5. Add to appendices – ‘In addition the proponents must include along with their proposal responses from tribes or documentation of conversations with potentially affected tribes’
6. EMPHASIZE – Need to have documentation about NEPA ready land.
7. Include in RFP – low impact restoration technology and techniques (i.e. such as minimizing soil disturbance)
8. Delete ‘geographically distinct’ from eligibility requirement – WALTER
9. EMPHASIZE the proponent must address all the criteria in the RFP
10. Checklist for interaction between proponents and the Forest Coordinators, this might help reduced the amount of silver bullets (not the same that is in the RFP)
11. BLM has maps that include land grants, this could be added to RFP, and contact information

## **Recommendations for the Annual Workshop**

To facilitate continuity in the program the retiring panel members should be invited to annual workshop

## **Recommendations for Panel Administration**

What went well this Panel meeting?

1. Addition of a Facilitator
2. Attendance and participation of the program managers
3. Attendance of District Ranger from Gila
4. Level of camaraderie and mutual respect, which resulted in open, candid, and thorough discussion of the projects
5. Agenda development and notification to proponents encouraged participation
6. Visual aids, two screens, scores added a lot to the process
7. Grants & Agreements expertise was very useful
8. Good organization and panel support – Staff Support
9. Panel made difficult funding allocation recommendations fairly and without prejudice
10. Change of facilities, much better this year
11. The consensus form of decision making was excellent and workable
12. Availability of boiler plate strengths and weaknesses
13. Panel members took solving other peoples problems as seriously as solving their own

## **Improvements (What could be done better)**

1. More self facilitation on when to stop
2. 5 page review sheet for each proposal could be consolidated – utilize strengths and weaknesses boiler plate, develop boiler plate list and include in panel review packet, group them by subject
3. Coordinate adjacent meeting rooms to minimize disruption and noise, the hotel facility should be aware that we need quiet space